

To: Laidlaw, Tina[Laidlaw.Tina@epa.gov]; plavigne@mt.gov[plavigne@mt.gov]
From: Blend, Jeff
Sent: Fri 9/6/2013 6:16:36 PM
Subject: RE: Meeting on the 18th

Okay. Her analysis was using the sliding scale and also using MT DOC numbers which suggest an MHI of 0.9%. She did some good work. Just so you know....

From: Laidlaw, Tina [mailto:Laidlaw.Tina@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 12:08 PM
To: LaVigne, Paul; Blend, Jeff
Subject: RE: Meeting on the 18th

For some reason, I think Shari did some more detailed analyses for several towns (Libby comes to mind as one)... so let's start and just see if we can at least work through the details of the process so Shari can more effectively communicate it to towns she works with. We can always tweak numbers later with more info...

How does that sound?

Tina

From: LaVigne, Paul [mailto:plavigne@mt.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 12:03 PM
To: Laidlaw, Tina; Blend, Jeff
Subject: RE: Meeting on the 18th

Tina, I think the biggest unknown, the most difficult question to answer and probably the single most important issue is: how much will this cost each community? We've obviously done the broad brush approach. I think Jeff has done a tremendous job there. But, in my opinion, to try to estimate costs for specific communities is about impossible without going into a full planning-level analysis – it is just so site-specific. I just don't have any suggestions about how to do this at that 'individual' level on any sort of defensible basis. Maybe Shari or Jeff can help there. But, we can certainly look at the WERF stuff and their assumptions and see if we are on the same page.

Paul

From: Laidlaw, Tina [<mailto:Laidlaw.Tina@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 11:42 AM
To: LaVigne, Paul; Blend, Jeff
Subject: RE: Meeting on the 18th

So – here is my “vision” (practicing for our meeting. ☺)

1. Let’s look at Jeff’s spreadsheets on the economic analysis for several specific communities – starting with the < 1 MGD group (we can let Shari pick the ones we review)
2. We can examine whether the WERF generic cost estimates to upgrade the plants to meet 6 mg/L and .6 mg/L TP (?) are accurate or completely off base. If incorrect, we can have Shari and Paul provide rough cost estimates.
3. Let’s look the community stats – did we miss anything?
4. If needed, quickly recalculate the economic impacts based on revised numbers. Is the MHI above 2%, demonstrating hardship? Are the proposed treatment technologies “affordable” or do we need to evaluate different treatment options?
5. Translate the values into numbers that mean something to the community (Shari had some ideas here).
6. Review values and see what we think is realistic.
7. Basically, for several communities, we’d be sketching out a plan for what the longer-term expectations would be for several smaller communities to see what the impacts would be.

From: LaVigne, Paul [<mailto:plavigne@mt.gov>]
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 11:20 AM
To: Blend, Jeff; Laidlaw, Tina
Subject: RE: Meeting on the 18th

[REDACTED]

Paul LaVigne

WPCSRF Program Manager

Montana DEQ

(406) 444-5321

Fax (406) 444-6836

plavigne@mt.gov

From: Blend, Jeff

Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 11:19 AM

To: LaVigne, Paul; Laidlaw, Tina

Subject: RE: Meeting on the 18th

[REDACTED]

From: LaVigne, Paul

Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 11:15 AM

To: Blend, Jeff; Laidlaw, Tina

Subject: RE: Meeting on the 18th

[REDACTED]

Paul

From: Blend, Jeff

Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 9:53 AM

To: Laidlaw, Tina; LaVigne, Paul

Subject: RE: Meeting on the 18th

No—I still have no specific idea. My sense is that we need to get stakeholders on board in terms of how the variance process works and get them un-confused. How we do that is beyond me, so I have no specific ideas. Maybe go through a few examples in detail?

Jeff